

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 were pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 16-20, and 35-36 have been amended. Claims 11, 29, and 37 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-10, 12-28, and 30-36 are now pending in the application.

The Examiner objected to claims 10 and 11 as being duplicate claims. Applicant has cancelled claim 11 to overcome this objection.

The Examiner objected to claim 18. Applicant has amended claim 18 to overcome this objection.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 12-14, 16-23, 26-27, 30-32, 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopprich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,792,474) in view of Wheeler et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0054151). Claims 6 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopprich and Wheeler, and further in view of Benantar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,854,056). Claims 7 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopprich and Wheeler, and further in view of Diersch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,606). Claims 10-11, 15, 28-29, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopprich and Wheeler, and further in view of “Blade Server IO Solutions” (hereinafter “Qlogic”).

1. Applicant respectfully submits that Hopprich and Wheeler, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “transferring a host identity between a first host system and a second host system”, “the first host system transferring the encoded host identity to the second host system”, and “designating the second host system as a destination host system for the host identity that is allocated to the first host system” as recited by claim 1.

On pages 2-3 of the pending Office Action, the Examiner contends that the above-highlighted feature of claim 1 is taught by Hopprich. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Hopprich teaches:

A DHCP server maintains a range or set of available network addresses that may be dynamically assigned, as needed, to computer systems or other devices that couple to the network and request an address for use on that network from the DHCP server. (Column 2, lines 59-63) (Emphasis added)

Hopprich further teaches:

The system of the invention provides a unique address assignment mechanism and technique that allows an address server such as a DHCP server to receive requests for network addresses from computer systems or other requesting devices. Based on an identity of the requesting computer system, or on another criteria, the address server can select an address for use on the network from either a set of local addresses or one or more sets of guest addresses. If the address server identifies the requesting computer system as a guest computer system, then a guest address selected from at least one set of guest addresses is assigned and provided to that computer system, whereas if the address server identifies the requesting computer system a local computer system then the address server selects and assigns a local address (from the set of local addresses) to the requesting local computer system. (Abstract, lines 1-16) (Emphasis added)

While Hopprich teaches a DHCP server receiving requests from computer systems for network addresses and the DHCP server selecting and assigning the computer systems either a guest address or a local address, Applicant submits that Hopprich fails to teach or suggest, “transferring a host identity between a first host system and a second host system”, “the first host system transferring the encoded host identity to the second host system”, and “designating the second host system as a destination host system for the host identity that is allocated to the first host system” as recited by claim 1. Hopprich teaches a DHCP server selecting and assigning an address from a range or set of available network addresses to a computer system that requested an address for use in the network. However, as noted above, Hopprich fails to teach a first system transferring a host identity that is allocated to the first system to a second system (see claim 1).

2. Applicant submits that Hopprich and Wheeler, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “the first host system encoding the host identity to be transferred using a parameter” as recited by claim 1.

On page 3 of the pending Office Action, the Examiner contends that the above-highlighted feature of claim 1 is taught at column 9, lines 12-16 of Hopprich. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Hopprich teaches:

The invention also provides embodiments related to configurations of computerized devices. According to some of such embodiments, an address server computer system is provided that includes a network interface coupled to a first network, a processor, a memory system encoded with address assignment instructions and encoded with at least one set of guest addresses and a set of local addresses, and an interconnection mechanism coupling the one communication port, the processor, and the memory system. In this arrangement, the processor performs the address assignment instructions encoded within the memory system to cause the address server to perform the operations related to address assignment, authentication, and verification, as summarized above. (Column 9, lines 4-16) (Emphasis added)

While Hopprich discloses a memory system that is encoded with address assignment instructions and encoded with at least a set of guest addresses and a set of local addresses, Applicant submits that Hopprich fails to teach or suggest, “the first host system encoding the host identity to be transferred using a parameter” as recited by claim 1. Applicant notes that the disclosed memory system that is encoded with address assignment instructions and network addresses is clearly not equivalent to “the first host system encoding the host identity to be transferred using a parameter” as recited by claim 1.

3. Applicant submits that Hopprich and Wheeler, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “the first host system...removing the host identity from its repository” as recited by claim 1.

On page 3 of the pending Office Action, the Examiner contends that the above-highlighted feature of claim 1 is taught at column 9, lines 37-42 of Hopprich. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Hopprich teaches:

According to another arrangement, the processor performs the address assignment instructions encoded within the memory system to further cause the address server to determine if the computer system coupled to the first network is at least one of a guest computer system and a local computer system. If the processor performs the address assignment instructions to determine that the computer system is a guest computer system, the processor selects an address for the computer system from the at least one set of guest addresses encoded in the memory system. (Column 9, lines 36-45)

While Hopprich discloses the above noted address assignment technique, Hopprich fails to teach or suggest, “the first host system...removing the host identity from its repository” as recited by claim 1.

In accordance, claim 1 is believed to patentably distinguish over Hopprich and Wheeler, whether alone or combined.

Likewise, independent claims 19 and 36 recite features similar to those highlighted above with regard to independent claim 1, and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references, whether alone or combined, for at least the reasons given in the above paragraphs discussing claim 1. Claims 20-34 are dependent upon claim 19 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

4. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Hopprich and Wheeler, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “an administrator system designating itself as an intermediate destination for the host identity allocated to the first host system” as recited by claim 17.

On page 4 of the pending Office Action, the Examiner contends that claim 17 is rejected for the same rationale as applied to claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As noted above, Hopprich discloses a DHCP server that receives requests from computer systems for network addresses. In response to the requests, the DHCP server selects and assigns the computer systems either a guest address or a local address from a

set of available network addresses. (Hopprich, Abstract, lines 1-16 and Column 2, lines 59-63)

Wheeler discloses a method for verifying the identity of a new-user of a computer system, in which at least one identity attribute is received from the new-user and similarity searched against at least one database of denied-user identity attributes. (Wheeler, page 1, paragraph [0005])

While Hopprich teaches a DHCP server that receives requests from computer systems for network addresses and assigns the computer system a network address from a set of available network addresses, and Wheeler teaches a method for verifying the identity of a new-user of a computer system, Applicant submits that Hopprich and Wheeler, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “an administrator system designating itself as an intermediate destination for the host identity allocated to the first host system” as recited by claim 17.

5. Applicant further submits that Hopprich and Wheeler, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “the first host system transferring the encoded host identity to the administrator system” and “the administrator system transferring the encoded host identity to the second host system” as recited by claim 17.

6. Additionally, Applicant submits that Hopprich and Wheeler, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “the first host system...removing the host identity from its repository” and “the administrator system...removing the host identity from its buffer” as recited by claim 17.

In accordance, claim 17 is believed to patentably distinguish over Hopprich and Wheeler, whether alone or combined.

Likewise, independent claim 35 recites features similar to those highlighted above with regard to independent claim 17, and is therefore believed to patentably distinguish

over the cited references, whether alone or combined, for at least the reasons given in the above paragraphs discussing claim 17.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-71000/MJL.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario J. Lewin
Reg. No. 54,268
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 9/25/07